Rick Goss
Information Technology Industry Council

Electronic Waste and Spent Lead Acid Batteries Capacity Building Workshop
4-6 December 2007: Tijuana, Mexico

Title of presentation: Policy and Regulatory Developments

I'm going to talk about design issues and policy and regulatory developments in the area of electronics recycling and about what manufactures are engaged in. And offer some thoughts on future policy developments.

First of all what is ITI? ITI is a major high tech trade association that's based in Washington, D.C. We have an environmental coalition that my staff of five and I manage on behalf of our membership here and we deal with 65 companies across the range of high tech and electronics industries here.

Where do we focus most of our efforts? What kind of companies do we work with here? We work with all the major producers of information technology, consumer electronics, telecommunications, cell phones and a broad array of medical devices, commercial industrial systems, electronic components. So we have a very broad membership base. Many companies have very similar interests in this regard here.

How we work with them. We're working broadly on e-waste and product stewardship. We are also engaged on product design, materials content, i.e., the RoHS issues and international coordination on design given the fact that we are a global industry. We design, distribute, sell our products on a global basis. So consistency is very important for our membership.

Energy efficiency is another key issue for us, especially as it relates to climate change and energy independence. Environmental purchasing initiatives, my colleague, Wayne Rifer, is going to speak later this morning about the EPEAT program for environmentally preferable products that is a program in which our leading member companies are extremely involved.

Last thing we work on broadly has to do with mercury labeling and reporting for products. And we engage for our companies both on advocacy and in compliance assistance. And in terms of some of the companies we work with, this is the 20 companies that are on the board of our environment coalition. These are most of the major companies that are involved in the electronics recycling debate, both on the information technology side, consumer electronics side and the cell phones wireless end of the world along with some of the industrial commercial medical device makers.

While we are here to talk about electronics recycling, obviously product design is one of the key issues involved in the electronics recycling debate. In fact, re-use and recycling are fundamentally linked to product design as we heard throughout the presentations

yesterday. The materials that manufacturers use in our products, the ability to re-use, upgrade, maintain and ultimately manage and disassemble those products are in large part a factor of the product design themselves.

What are manufacturers doing in this regard? This is going to be the first portion of my presentation. The key on top there is to reduce and eliminate substances of concern. Improving overall energy efficiency of our products. Increasing the product functionality. By that I mean having a product that performs more than a single function. As you look at some of the multi-function devices, as you look at cell phones that are now web browsers and music players you have more functionality in one device, obviously you're able to conserve resources by having a single device that performs multiple functions as opposed to several different devices, each with its own footprint.

Then obviously designing for easy maintenance, the ability to upgrade products to extend their useful life and ultimately for disassembly and recycling. So those are some of the key priorities in terms of the design end.

What is the commitment from the leading companies in our industry? And I'll go through and demonstrate some of the actual concrete achievements in a couple of slides. Going beyond compliance, as you can note from the companies and those are just the 20 board companies that we're engaged with and there are several dozen others obviously. But a lot of those companies are well known for moving far beyond compliance for actually designing and marketing their products and basing their brand reputation on their ability to increase through innovation, increase the environmental performance, increase the energy efficiency of their product base.

We are obviously a very innovative industry. We pride ourselves on that. There's a continuous evolution in terms of our products. A key goal here is to minimize or eliminate the use of compounds of concern whenever feasible and to base decisions, design decisions on sound science, but also taking a look at product performance, reliability and lifecycle long term reliability. That's one of our key points here.

What have we done? I think we're one of the rare industries that can make this claim that because of our commitment to continuous improvement every year, our products become more energy efficient, incorporate innovative materials and design advances, become easier to upgrade, disassemble and recycle. All one needs to do is compare the big CRT television from ten, twelve years ago to some of the flat panels today, to look at some of the laptops and smaller portable devices that have replaced desktop computers or to use the example I already used to have a small multi function device that's a phone, a web browser and a music player as opposed to having multiple different devices to see the actual outcome of some of these policies and commitments.

So, as a baseline, our member companies, as well as the broader industry comply with the EU directive on the Restriction of Hazardous Substances, the ROHS directive. That for most of our companies is a floor, it's a baseline requirement. Many of our companies have long standing design and materials policies that pre-date the ROHS directive by many years. In fact the ROHS directive, the EU ROHS directive was based in large part

on the design innovations that our own industry had demonstrated was achievable. Basically the European Union came in, looked at best practices across the electronics industry, said, all right, these different advances and improvements are feasible. We're going to require the rest of the industry to come up to that level.

So a lot of the innovations, a lot of the requirements you see came out of the electronics industry and are now formalized in the ROHS directive and other initiatives.

A key question we always are asked to answer is why do electronics contain some of these compounds to begin with? There was a lot of discussion about lead in CRTs, about mercury in backlights, about brominated flame-retardants and other compounds. Electronics contain certain heavy metals. They contain certain flame-retardants because of those very unique and irreplaceable characteristics in regards to consumer safety, product performance and reliability and overall energy efficiency. There is no desire on the part of manufacturers to use mercury.

As we are able to find innovative replacements, as we're able to substitute out the use of these compounds and find feasible, technologically acceptable replacements, that's what we do. When there's no requirement or need for us to use these, we phase them out.

The ROHS directive has numerous exemptions for the use of these very compounds because, at this point, there are no technologically feasible alternatives. I'll give some examples here, three that are key to our industry. One is the use of lead and CRT glass. As the US EPA mentioned yesterday, what you have is perhaps four plus pounds of lead in a cathode ray tube to shield the consumer from the radiation. That's there for consumer safety.

You have small mercury back lights and flat panel displays such as this laptop here that allow for energy efficient illumination. That has two major benefits; one it allows us to forego the use of a cathode ray tube. If you can replace a CRT with a flat panel display, you've now foregone the use of that four pounds of lead. In addition, a flat panel display is far more energy efficient than a cathode ray tube. Since most of the emissions of mercury in the atmosphere come out of coal burning power plants, the ability to reduce energy demand has a direct correlation to a reduction in mercury emissions.

Now, obviously there is an issue with the fact that the flat panels do contain a mercury bulb or sometimes more than one mercury bulb. And as we heard yesterday from several of the regulators and recyclers, those can and do need to be managed properly because mercury is a major issue.

Another exemption, DECA brominated flame retardant. Polybrominated diphenyl ether as a flame retardant for use in flame retardant properties.

In terms of going beyond ROHS, our industry is global in nature, as I mentioned before, in terms of design, in terms of manufacture and distribution. So when the ROHS directive was enacted or implemented in July of 2006, at that point most of the leading manufacturers had already gone through the entire supply chain, had gone through with

their component suppliers, material suppliers, with their inventory management to make sure that they were ROHS compliant.

And in doing that they made sure that they were ROHS compliant, not just for the European Union, but for the broader global community. What we do not have for the major producers for the common equipment that you see in households and businesses, you do not have separate product lines. You do not have a ROHS compliant product line that's sold in the European Union and a non-ROHS product line that's being manufactured and sold in other jurisdictions.

Now at the higher end, some of the more sophisticated systems, telecommunication systems for example, there still is a bit of a lag in terms of making those systems ROHS compliant for the North American market because there are different requirements. There are different FCC or FDA requirements that have manufacturers moving rapidly to make sure that the systems, the major systems that do have some differences, are designed and are ROHS compliant and we're obviously well along on that role. And I would imagine that within the next two to three years even those larger systems will be completely ROHS compliant.

The leading companies, the companies that we work with most closely, have already gone beyond ROHS. ROHS, we look at as a floor. It's a basic compliance requirement, but our companies have gone far beyond that. In fact, a lot of our companies no longer even use certain compounds even though they have exemptions under ROHS. And I'll mention one that I already brought up here, which is the use of the flame retardant, DECA BDE. A lot of our manufactures in certain product lines have figured out that they can substitute DECA BDE with other flame-retardants or they can make plastic casings thicker to prevent or reduce the possibility of fires. So they've been able to get rid of DECA BDE or phase it out.

Also, as I mentioned here, mercury back lights and flat panel displays. The lighting technology that's commonly used in a cell phone or a Blackberry or an IPod or things like that is called a light emitting diode that includes no mercury. Over the past several years that technology has been scaled up and is now in use in larger and larger displays. And within the next several years as technological advances continue what we will see is that that non mercury lighting technology will replace the mercury back lights in even larger screens. And so obviously that would be a major accomplishment because you will now have a situation where you're no longer using the CRTs with lead, you no longer have the larger energy efficiency drain of CRTs. And you're also not using any mercury in order to get to that outcome.

In terms of what else the major manufacturers are doing, even beyond ROHS, is in terms of phasing out and substituting compounds that are not even subject to ROHS at this point. Phasing out the use of polyvinyl chloride in certain products. Phasing out the use of arsenic in glass. Looking continuously to reduce, eliminate, substitute other materials of potential concern where technically feasible alternatives exist and where they don't impact quality reliability and long term performance of the products.

Some additional design initiatives here, beyond simply the use of materials, looking at the ability to design products to be readily assembled, to be maintained and upgraded during their useful lives, especially in the consumer electronic space. We have an extremely competitive industry. If you look at all the different market entrants, the companies that come and go, enter the market and leave the market, any advantage that a manufacturer can obtain through a more streamlined manufacturing process in terms of using fewer screws and fewer connectors, using more of the same types of plastics, having more of a market for that, is going to be an advantage at the manufacturing end. That also translates into ease of maintenance. It also translates into easy of final disassembly and disposition.

At the same time we're seeing a constant evolution where our products become smaller. They become lighter and at the same time increase their functionality. If you look at a desktop computer now, or a monitor now, compared to a few years ago, or a television now compared to a big console television, it's apparent in terms of the size, the weight, the volume of that product that it's much smaller and it has more functionality to it. And that's an important part on the front of the market for our manufacturers. Obviously transportation costs are major when you're talking about products.

The ability to make products lighter and smaller saves money at the front end, but it also makes it that much easier and cheaper to collect those products at the end of life. So we see a lot of these design advances going into ease of disassembly, maintenance and recycling.

So now I'm going to the recycling end. Why should we recycle? Obviously we have a presence of certain compounds in electronics. Those compounds do have human health and environmental effects if they're not managed properly. They need to be appropriately recovered, they need to be appropriately managed at the end of life. One of the key points there, the sub-bullet is that proper management prevents potential risks.

Recycling electronics is far preferable than disposing of them in landfills or incinerators. I think just basic common sense from a resource conservation and energy efficient standpoint, from a landfill space standpoint, there is no logical argument to look at this and say, we can just put everything in a landfill.

So what are some of the challenges involved? Here's (on slide) one of the biggest ones. There are 120 million American households. There's a virtual 100 percent saturation rate of televisions. In fact, the average U.S. household has close to three televisions. On average U.S. households have computers, cell phones, DVD players, MP3 players, I could go on to list microwaves, toaster ovens and VCRs, but I think everyone kind of understands and is well aware of the phenomenon here.

Now the issue with that is how do you effectively, fairly collect these devices at the end of life in the U.S. from 120 million households, not to mention in the rest of the world. So what's one of the challenges here? The vast majority of products that are sold to residential consumers are still sold through traditional retail distribution networks.

What we have are manufacturers who will sell to distributors or wholesalers. They'll sell to retailers who have their own national or regional distribution networks. So the manufacturers are often several steps removed from the consumer. That said, a lot of the state laws in the U.S. have said to the manufacturers, you own the sole obligation now for collecting directly from the end user, directly from the consumer, years after you made the product.

Now obviously one of the challenges is we don't have a direct relationship with the consumer for the most part at the time of sale, let alone six, eight, ten, twenty years later when that consumer is ready to generate that product for recycling. Manufacturers are experts in design and manufacturing and production. We're not experts in collection and distribution. That's why we rely on a larger network to do that.

So what's the outcome of this? Two and a half years ago, February 2005, our industry went to the U.S. Congress to push for federal legislation. What we saw at the time was that there were two states, California and Maine, that had enacted electronics recycling requirements. There were numerous other U.S. states that had bills introduced and were under active consideration. And from a manufacturer's standpoint, the last thing we wanted was this patchwork of inconsistent state approaches.

We were concerned about regulatory inconsistency. Market disruption. Consumer confusion. And, of course, the fact that a state patchwork of different inconsistent potentially conflicting requirements would increase costs without increasing environmental protection.

As a result of our engagement, the U.S. House and Senate held first ever hearings on electronics recycling in 2005. So what did we talk about? What was our testimony? We emphasized the fact, that the manufacturers do control product design and production. But we're only one of several major key institutional players involved in product distribution, collection and recycling. I've listed some of the major players here (on slide), I think I mentioned some of them already; distributors, retailers, the government itself, not only as a regulatory legislative entity, but as the key purchaser of IT equipment in the U.S. Non-governmental organizations and charities. And recyclers.

Here's straight from my testimony to the U.S. Senate, "the combined goal of these institutional stakeholders should be to develop a recycling infrastructure that is convenient for the residential consumer." And that was our goal as the manufacturing community to come in and say, we're willing to do our part in helping you to resolve this challenge, but we can't do it alone. We don't distribute our products alone, we can't recycle and collect them alone. We're willing to step up to the table, but we need others to be engaged as well.

One of the possible approaches here that our industry thinks makes a lot of sense is using retailer reverse distribution. I know that was mentioned by a couple of the speakers yesterday. You have retailers, major U.S. retailers, also some smaller retailers. You have stores in thousands of communities. They're the key connection between the consumer base and the sales of new products.

Office Depot and Staples, which are two major U.S. retailers, have established permanent programs as part of their customer service commitment to allow their customers to come in and either for a fee or for free to return products. Unfortunately those two are the exception rather than the rule in terms of the retailer community.

So moving beyond, here we testified to Congress over two years ago and in the interim, at the Congressional level in the U.S. not a whole lot has happened. There has been quite a bit of discussion and we've been very engaged in that discussion. There are four members of the U.S. Congress who have put together this House e-waste working group. I'm not sure how that will translate. But then also Senator Ron Wyden, who is a U.S. Senator from Oregon, is also extremely involved. And we've been in discussions with the various Senate and House staff for the last two plus years.

They are putting together a concept bill on electronics recycling that they expect to release as early as this month for stakeholder review. Frankly I would not expect to see an actual bill introduced until 2008 and I would be skeptical that we will see any real action in the U.S. Congress until, at the earliest, 2009.

Some of the other efforts that our industry is undertaking on its own outside of legislation; in terms of our companies themselves, there were discussions yesterday about some of the programs that our major member companies run or are engaged in. From our point of view, when our major member collect used products, whether it's their own brand or other brands, they make sure that they are recovered and properly managed by trained personnel in appropriate facilities.

In terms of the processes that they go through with potential recyclers to make sure that those recyclers are meeting all the relevant requirements in terms of safe and proper management, in terms of trained personal, in terms of site visits, financial audits, insurance audits, right down the line - there's too much concern among our major member companies in terms of potential legal, financial, public affairs liability for them to use or rely on collectors or recyclers who have not met a very high level of scrutiny.

Bob Tonetti of EPA yesterday talked at length about EPA's Cathode Ray Tube Rule. Our industry was very supportive of that rule. I think we played a key role in the final adoption of that and certainly I think it makes a lot of sense in terms of its ability to restrict the export of end of life CRTs. And Bob obviously went through the regulatory regime surrounding that, but it's certainly been a major step forward as of January of this year.

And as Mr. Tonettii also mentioned at length yesterday, ITI and our individual manufacturers are very engaged in the US EPA process, facilitated process, with a number of other stakeholders on establishing recycler certification responsible for recycling practices.

In terms of some specific successes that our industry has achieved. We have been involved in the proper recovery and management of well over two billion pounds of used electronics products. We use significant quantities of recycled materials in our new

products; glass, metals, plastics. This helps create a market for those new products. It helps create and sustain a market for recycled materials and for the recycling industry.

Some of the different programmatic efforts, some of them were discussed yesterday in specifics. They are individual company programs but a lot of efforts in terms of partnerships with US EPA, with state and local governments, and I'm focusing on the U.S. experience here, with retailers, recyclers, with charities such as Goodwill as we saw in the presentation yesterday. Obviously there is still a need for a broader, more consistent infrastructure in the U.S., not to mention in many other countries. But these are some of the efforts underway broadly in terms of what the manufacturing community and some other stakeholders are engaged in.

Now, what's the outcome of some of this in terms of the design advances, in terms of the products stewardship and innovation. High profile companies, such as the ones that we work with, obviously are very sensitive to public pressure. They're very focused on brand reputation. They are very focused on their ability to distinguish themselves in the marketplace as sustainable corporations and good corporate actors. So they're being measured against what's known as the triple bottom line. Economic, environmental and social bottom lines.

And so you have several major global respected indices here. The Global 100 of the most sustainable corporations. The Dow Jones Sustainability Index in New York. The Financial Times Sustainability Index in London. And if you look at those you'll see many of our major corporations that we represent are listed on one or more of those indices in terms of their overall sustainability practices.

So, despite our engagement at the federal level, two and a half, almost three years ago this time, at the time when there were only two states that had laws on the books, we woke up in July of this year to find that that had expanded to nine U.S. states. And I say this as a former State legislative staffer in New York, states do not wait around very long for the U.S. Congress to act.

Frankly after several years of sitting and waiting to see if the federal government was going to act in this regard, you can see that many states became frustrated and went out and acted on their own.

When we entered 2007 we had four states, the ones listed in the left hand column (of slide) that had already enacted laws. When we finished the six-month state legislative sessions this year that had grown from four to nine. That raises major issues in terms of some of the concerns that our industry had before that I listed on a prior slide, in terms of regulatory inconsistency, in terms of increased costs, right down the line.

We have several other potential jurisdictions in the U.S. including New York City. I mean here we are. We're hoping to get this addressed at a consistent federal level and we have cities now looking to legislate in this area. So this is a major, major concern to our industry. And I've listed some of the other states in addition to the City of New York, some of the other states that may be poised to act this year. So we could end up within

the next two years or so jumping from four to nine as many as probably sixteen states and perhaps the City of New York with requirements on the books.

It's not the kind of patchwork that we would like to see. And why is that? To just reemphasize the point here, the states that have acted, the nine states so far, no two are the same. And that's a major issue for us as we try to comply with these.

You have a lack of a consistent product scope. Different states cover different products. Different screen sizes. Some include certain products, some exempt certain products. There are varying definitions, varying legal interpretations, statutory requirements. In terms of what is a portable consumer, excuse me, a portable computer? Who is the obligated brand owner? There are different metrics in terms of how to determine a manufacturer's obligation. Is it based on your return share, for example, the actual amount of volume by weight of products with your brand to come back in the system? Or is it being based on your current share of the market? Either in units or in pounds?

I had put this on two pages because there are a few more here (on slide). There's the orphan issue, which basically refers to products whose original manufacturers are bankrupt or have disappeared from the marketplace. Who is responsible for that? Are today's manufacturers responsible for the products that their competitors made yesterday? And who ends up paying for those products here?

We have the CRT rule that EPA described yesterday. One of the issues with the CRT rule is that states, U.S. states are still allowed to impose more stringent requirements on the transport of cathode ray tubes, either within a state or between states. And this has led to increased costs and to regulatory inconsistencies and that's a major concern for us as well. And then the last issue I'll put up here is that there are numerous largely inconsistent registration requirements for manufacturers, recordkeeping and reporting requirements our manufacturing members have to go through and basically every time a new state comes along they have to add more staff and add more ability to comply with these different requirements of this various patchwork.

If I back up to February 2005 when we went to the U.S. Congress and there were only two states with laws on the books, this is the exact outcome we were hoping to avoid at that time by being proactive as an industry going to the Congress saying we'd like this to be regulated on a consistent, national basis. Unfortunately that has not happened.

Some conclusions here. Design is within the purview of the manufacturers, as is our supply chain. Obviously I started my presentation by talking about a lot of the design innovations that our members have achieved that go far above and beyond the regulatory requirements. The fact that our members actually look to gain market share to differentiate their products and to enhance their public reputations in the marketplace by going above and beyond by increasing the energy efficiency of their products. By improving the environmental footprint of their products.

When it comes to electronics re-use and recycling though, it can't be manufacturers alone. There are so many other major institutional players that are involved in the sale and

distribution, not to mention the collection and recycling of these products. And unfortunately what we're seeing from the manufacturers' standpoint is that in most cases the obligation falls solely on us. The rest of the major stakeholders have little to no engagement on this.

So what we would like to see is concerted and coordinated effort and action from all the players to require that we can properly and fairly resolve the challenge here. I'll go back to that without backing up and going back to the slide from our Congressional testimony that it's really, in our opinion, the obligation of all the major institutional players to coordinate a system that's easy and convenient for the residential consumer. Manufacturers have certainly stepped up and are playing our role in that process, but we need to have others do the same.

Finally, why is regulatory consistency and national coordination so important to us? It helps ensure that products are properly re-used and recycled. It makes sure that programs are efficient and cost effective. The cost of the program is ultimately going to be borne by the consumer, as with any other regulatory requirement for manufacturers or the business community. The more it costs to comply, the more those costs have to be passed along ultimately through the supply chain to the consumer.

The more effectively we can, as the broad stakeholder group, meet these requirements in an environmentally sound manner, the better it is for all stakeholders and the better it is for the consumers. Preserving market balance is a key point for us. Avoiding consumer confusion and obviously the key point at the end there, providing recycling opportunities for consumers. So that's what we would like to achieve. And here's my contact information. And I would be happy to field any questions if I have time.

[Audience]
Buenos días; soy Juan Barrera del Instituto Nacional de Ecología de México. Ayer comentaba yo sobre las dos líneas de producción con diferentes estándares de emisión, ese caso tengo entendido fue bastante comprobado en el Estado de Coahuila en México. En relación con los mercados globales y los estándares globales para las sustancias que están incorporadas en el equipo electrónico. Cuando entra en vigor una directiva como la ROCH y la adopta el Industry Counsil, ¿qué ocurre por ejemplo a la cadena de ensamble y producción en todos los mercados globales? En el caso digamos de una empresa como IBM que ha derivado todos los aspectos de producción a LENOVO, se adopta inmediatamente, no hay un "laptime" a lo largo de toda la cadena para que se adopte un estándar cuando lo adoptan las cúpulas lo adoptan inmediatamente todos los sectores que vienen detrás de la cadena global en todos los lugares del mundo. Esa es una pregunta. Y la otra pregunta es: ¿si en el caso de los retardantes de flama se está haciendo algún tipo de investigación para buscar sustitutos que no tengan las propiedades tóxicas, persistentes y acumulables de los bifenilos polibromados, de los DKBDE?

[Rick Goss]
Let me take the questions in order here, if I understand properly here. The first question had to do with how quickly or how thoroughly is the EU ROHS directive once it took

effect, basically taking effect globally, because of the point I mentioned on the global supply chain.

What we're seeing, you mentioned IBM as an example of a company, and I'll use that as my example here. Whether it's IBM or HP or Sony, what you have is a situation where, in order to prepare for the EU ROHS directive and the effective date in July of 2006, you had major corporations working with, and I won't even use the term supply chain, I'll use the term supply pyramid because there are, you know, thousands of blocks in that supply pyramid.

We're working with those suppliers, both component suppliers and material suppliers to make sure they understood the requirements. To institute and implement a due diligence process requiring reporting, paperwork, sharing of information, going up that entire supply pyramid. And what you see is when a company like an IBM or an HP or a Sony recognizes that it needs to redesign its products, test them for long term reliability and quality for a major market like the European Union, they're going to move that entire supply pyramid all in one direction globally.

Because those same suppliers, whether it's components or materials, that are supplying materials to them for the EU market are also supplying materials to them that they're going to be using to design and build products for Asia, North America, Latin America, you name it.

And so what you see here is while it may just be the EU ROHS directive and it's been mimicked by China, California, South Korea and elsewhere, the fact that the EU is such a major player and the fact that we have a global industry meant that the entire supply pyramid had to basically shift a few degrees to make compliant products for the EU and in doing so it's now making compliant products for the rest of the global marketplace.

In terms of the second question on brominated flame-retardants. DECA BDE is the one brominated flame retardant that does have an exemption under the EU ROHS directive. As I noted in my slides, many of our companies have already substituted out DECA BDE either by using other types of flame retardants or by changing the design of their products by using thicker plastic casings that help reduce the potential that there is going to be a fire.

There's been a lot of research done into other flame-retardants such as phosphorous-based flame-retardants. There are some concerns with phosphorous-based flame-retardants in terms of long-term reliability, which is a key concern for our industry. I believe that the EPA speaker may be able to address a couple of more comments on the brominated flame retardant issue because the EPA is leading a project on that and she will be speaking in a moment.

[Audience]
I just want to address one question. It's very easy. Do you have a workgroup together with Mexican authorities today in order to share best practices?

[Audience]
¿Tienen un grupo de trabajo con las autoridades mexicanas para compartir las mejores prácticas de reciclaje actualmente?

[Rick Goss]
My organization, ITI, does not have a direct program with the Mexican authorities. We've been working through this venue, a lot of our major manufacturers, such as Dell and Hewlett-Packard and, you know, Sony and Panasonic have operations here in Mexico and I can get back to you with some information on some of the efforts that they put together. And I'd be happy to talk about the ways that we could better coordinate in terms of sharing some best practices.

[Audience]
La pregunta va enfocada a que tenemos la mayoría de todas estas empresas en México como maquiladores o como fabricantes o como comercializadores. Entonces, el esfuerzo de este tipo de mesas es compartir las mejores prácticas para buscar resultados conjuntos. Entonces, yo agradecería si ustedes también contactan a las autoridades mexicanas para salir adelante con este tema, ¿no?

[Rick Goss]
Alright. Certainly, can we discuss during the break?

.